

**Amendment to the Drawings**

Please replace the original drawing sheets 1 – 5 with replacement sheets 1 – 7 attached hereto in the appendix.

**REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

Claims 6 – 16 were rejected. Claims 1 – 5 were withdrawn as being drawn to non-elected distinct inventions. In this amendment claims 6, 9 and 10 have been amended, claims 7 and 16 have been cancelled and new claims 17 – 24 have been added. No additional fees are required as the total number of pending claims is twenty with two independent claims.

The examiner stated that a restriction to was required under 35 U.S.C. 121 in that Group II claims 1 – 4 were drawn to a method, Group II claim 5 was drawn to a rotational mold and Group III claims 6 – 16 were directed to the actuating venting assembly.

A provisional election was made by David King during a telephone conversation in January 2006, without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group III, claims 6 – 16. Applicant hereby affirms that election. Claims 1 – 5 were withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner under 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) in that the removably attached feature of claim 10 and the separate but adjacent feature of the stem and pistons were not shown. New drawings figures 8 and 9 show these features. No new matter has been added and the support for the drawings can be found in paragraph 30.

The examiner objected to claim 10 due to the informality “removable attached” which was amended to read “removably attached”. Applicants made the correction.

Claims 6 – 16 were rejected 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The examiner stated in claim 6, line 2, “a housing having for attachment” is unclear and apparently incomplete; claim 9 should depend from claim 8 in order to provide antecedent basis for “the piercing tip”; in claim 11, line 3, “the internal cavity” is noted to lack proper antecedent basis in the claim; claim 15 was indefinite in that the body of the piston and the stem being “separate but adjacent” was contrary to the claim recitation in independent claim 6, lines 6-7, of “the stem extending from the body of the piston”; and claim 16 was cancelled.

Applicants have amended claim 6 to correct the deficiencies noted by the examiner. The insertion of an internal cavity in claim 6 remedies the antecedent basis problem in claim 11, and the recitation that the stem is adjacent to or extending from the body of the piston is also addressed in claim 6 correcting the issue raised in claim 15. Accordingly applicants request this

rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 8, 10, 11, 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Clark et al. (US Patent 5,482,721; figures 3-5). Applicants amended claim 6 incorporating the subject matter of cancelled claim 7. Applicants also cancelled claim 16. This amendment renders this rejection moot.

The examiner noted an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a); Claims 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al (US Patent 5,482,721; figures 3-5). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al (US Patent 5,482,721; figures 3-5) in view of Boyce et al (US Patent 6,280,176). Applicant's amendment of claim 6 renders this rejection of claims 9, 12 and 13 moot.

The examiner stated that claims 7 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants amended claim 6 incorporating the subject matter of claim 7 and have added new claim 17 which has incorporated the subject matter of claim 15 in independent claim form, placing both independent claims in a condition of allowance. Claim 17 has new claims 18 – 24 appended thereto. These dependent claims contain the subject matter of original claims 8 – 16.

For the reasons stated above, applicants respectfully request the examiner to withdraw the rejections and allow the application to pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



David L. King, Registration No. 33,925  
Attorney for Applicants

David L. King, Sr.  
5131 NE County Road 340  
High Springs, FL 32643  
(386)454-7206